EXHIBIT Y TESTIMONY OF JEROME C. WEINERT

BEFORE THE PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

AQUA PENNSYLVANIA WASTEWATER, INC. DOCKET NO. A-2021-3027268

AQUA STATEMENT NO. 5

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF
JEROME C. WEINERT, PE, ASA, CDP
UTILITY VALUATION EXPERT
SELECTED BY
WILLISTOWN TOWNSHIP, PENNSYLVANIA

Date: August 2021

1	Q.	Please state your name, business address, and occupation.
2	A.	My name is Jerome C. Weinert. My business address is 8555 West Forest Home Avenue,
3		Suite 201, Greenfield, WI 53228. I am a Principal and Director of AUS Consultants, Inc.
4		("AUS Consultants"). This testimony was prepared by me.
5		
6	Q.	Please describe your qualifications and indicate if you are registered as a Utility
7		Valuation Expert with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission.
8	A.	My curriculum vitae ("CV") is attached to my report and this testimony. AUS Consultants
9		is a registered Utility Valuation Expert with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
10		("PUC"). We obtained that registration in 2016 and were informed of our latest renewal
11		by the PUC's Secretary on January 12, 2021.
12		
13	Q.	What is the purpose of your testimony?
14	A.	This direct testimony provides clarification and explanation of the appraisal I provided to
15		Willistown Township, Pennsylvania, the Selling Utility pursuant to 66 Pa. C.S. §
16		1329(a)(5) and in accordance with the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal
17		Practice ("USPAP") (2020-2021 Edition).
18		
19	Q.	Are you advocating for any party or outcome?
20	A.	No. The Ethics Rule of the USPAP, applicable here pursuant to 66 Pa. C.S. § 1329(a)(3),
21		requires that I perform the appraisal with impartiality, objectivity, and independence, and
22		without accommodation of personal interests. In addition, the USPAP Ethics Rule requires
23		that I not perform the assignment with bias, that I must not advocate the cause or interest

1		of any party or issue and that I must not accept an assignment that includes the reporting
2		of predetermined opinions and conclusions.
3		
4	Q.	Do you have any affiliation with either the Acquiring Utility or the Selling Utility or
5		Entity?
6	A.	No. Other than the current assignment to provide the subject appraisal, I have no business
7		or personal relationships with any party to the proposed acquisition.
8		
9	Q.	What is your fee arrangement to deliver the appraisal?
10	A.	A copy of the fee arrangement is included with the Application as Exhibit S2 . In summary,
11		AUS Consultants are to receive \$25,000 to \$27,000 plus expenses in compensation for our
12		appraisal, which represents approximately 0.11% to 0.12% of the appraised value.
13		
14	Q.	Will you receive that fee regardless of whether the Commission approves the
15		proposed transaction or whether it closes?
16	A.	Yes. 66 Pa. C.S. § 1329(a)(3) mandates that I comply with the USPAP when developing
17		my appraisal. Under the USPAP, I cannot perform the appraisal with bias and acceptance
18		of a fee contingent on a particular outcome like closing or Commission approval would
19		violate that Ethics Rule.
20		
21	Q.	Have you prepared any exhibits, schedules, or appendices to accompany your direct
22		testimony?

Yes. The appraisal I submitted to the Seller pursuant to Section 1329(a)(5) is included in the Application as **Exhibit R**. The appraisal includes a narrative and supporting exhibits in sections. All were prepared under my supervision and control. Also, as stated above, attached to this testimony as **Appendix A** is my CV.

5

6

7

- Q. Please summarize your results of the application of the cost, market, and income approaches to valuation.
- 8 A. The summary results of the cost, income, and market approaches are presented below.

Appraisal Approach	Value Indicator	Weight	Wtd Value Indicator
Cost	18,498,555	50%	9,249,278
Income	18,235,751	40%	7,294,300
Market	25,695,620	10%	2,569,562
Appraisal Conclusion			19,113,140

10

11

12

- Q. Please describe any assumptions, extraordinary assumptions, hypothetical conditions, and/or limiting conditions that you applied to the valuation.
- The major assumptions and limiting conditions used in preparing our appraisal of the
 Willistown Wastewater Collection and Treatment System are described in our appraisal
 report "Fair Market Appraisal Report of Willistown Township, Pennsylvania's (PA)
 Wastewater Collection and Treatment System, as of January 20, 2021." Beyond the abovedescribed assumptions, there are no extraordinary¹ or hypothetical² assumptions (as
 defined in the 2020-2021 edition of USPAP).

¹ Extraordinary assumption: an assignment-specific assumption as of the effective date regarding uncertain information used in an analysis which, if found to be false, could alter the appraiser's opinions or conclusions. 2020-2021 USPAP page 4.

² Hypothetical condition: a condition, directly related to a specific assignment, which is contrary to what is known by the appraiser to exist on the effective date of the assignment results, but used for the purpose of analysis. 2020-2021 USPAP page 4.

1		
2	Q.	How was each assumption used and what was its result?
3	A.	The assumptions are detailed in my appraisal report and are discussed further in this
4		testimony.
5		
6	Q.	How did you develop the weighting applied to each approach in your appraisal and
7		why are the individual weights you chose appropriate for this proposed transaction?
8	A.	For the cost approach I chose a weighting of 50%. It is my opinion that this weighting is
9		appropriate for the cost approach because the major purpose of this appraisal is to be an
10		input to the Commission's establishment of cost for future ratemaking and the cost
11		approach conclusion is directly reflective of the property cost.
12		For the market approach, I chose a weighting of 10%. It is my opinion that this
13		weighting is appropriate for the market approach because while the market approach
14		provides some information as to the value of the property, establishing comparability
15		between the individual sales to the subject property is difficult and uncertain therefore
16		requiring less weight of the market approach and the 10% weight accomplishes that
17		objective.
18		For the income approach, I chose a weighting of 40%. It is my opinion that this
19		weighting is appropriate for the income approach because the income approach reflects the

22

20

21

objective.

value of the property's return to the property's owner. The 40% weight accomplishes that

- 1 Q. Did you conduct an on-site inspection of the Selling Utility assets, and if so, what was 2 its result on the appraisal?
- No. AUS Consultants relied on the aging of the investment provided in the Engineer's A. 3 Assessment to assess the condition of the system. 4

What Utility Earnings Report was used to create the capital structure used in your 6 Q.

7 appraisal? I used a market required capital structure (detailed in the Cost of Capital / Required Return 8 A. portion of our appraisal report). Information used in developing the market capital 9 structure was obtained from financial statistics reported in Value Line Investment Survey

for the water / wastewater industry published in their January 8, 2021, issue. 11

Q. What capital structure was used in your appraisal? 13

The capital structure used in my appraisal is included below. 14 A.

Water and Wastewater Cost of Capital							
First Quarter 2021 (0-01-2021)							
As an Investor-Owned Utility							
Weighted Cost of Capital (Discount Rate)							
(1)	(2)	(2a)	(3)	(3a)	(4)	(4a)	(5)
	Portion of Capital	Type of Data	Capital Cost	Type of Data	Tax Rate	Tax affect on cost of capital	After-tax Market Capital Cost
	AUS Input		AUS Input				(2)*(3)*(4a)
Debt	29%	Market	2.79%	Market	28.89%	71.11%	0.58%
Equity	71%	Market	9.85%	Market	0.0%	100.0%	6.99%
Total Capital r	100.0%						7.57%
Growth (g)							1.82%
Rate without Growth: [(1+r)/(1+g)]-1							5.65%

16

15

5

10

12

1	Cost	<u>Approach</u>
2	Q.	Regarding your application of the cost approach, what method did you use to
3		determine the cost approach result (e.g. original cost, replacement cost, reproduction
4		cost)?
5	A.	I used the replacement cost method.
6		
7	Q.	Please explain why you chose the replacement cost method.
8	A.	I chose the replacement cost method because it is considered the proper starting point for
9		a cost approach. Replacement cost reflects the appraisal date cost of providing the
10		property's functionality and capacity at the appraisal date using recognized materials and
11		labor costs.
12		
13	Q.	What index did you use for that method?
14	A.	I used the Handy Whitman Index of Public Utility Construction Costs for the Water
15		Industry (Northeastern US Region), AUS Telephone Index (General Plant), and various
16		United States Bureau of Labor Statistics cost index series.
17		
18	Q.	Under your application of the cost approach what assets did you value or trend
19		differently from other assets and why was that necessary?
20	A.	I costed each property account with cost trends appropriate for the property contained in
21		the account. As such, the costing of each property account may differ from account to
22		account. It is my opinion that an accurate appraisal requires each property account be
23		costed with cost trends reflective of the property contained in the account. For the assets

associated with Land and Land Rights, appraisal date costs were estimated. For the appraisal date cost of obtaining and registering the easement with the Register of Deeds, estimates were developed based on the time and cost associated with developing the easement, contacting the property owner and registering the easement.

Willistown Township's property, as detailed in the Pennoni Associates, Inc. "Engineer's Assessment" of \$19,641,519.75, was determined to have a replacement cost new of \$49,898,907 summarized as follows:

		ater Collection System						
		ion System and Treatment						
	wned Util	•						
As of Janu	uary 20, 20	121						
Replacem	ent Cost N	New (RCN)						
(1)	(2)	(3)	(9)	(10)	(13)	(14)	(15) Reproduction Cost New (RCN) to	(16)
Account	Account	Asset Description	Original Cost	Costing Parameter	Cost Translator	Reproduction Cost New (RCN)	Replacement Cost New (COR)	Replacement Cost New (COR)
			OC \$s			RCN \$s	COR \$s / RCN \$s	COR \$s
Input	Input	Input	Input	Input	Calculation	Calculation	Input	Calculation
Eng Assmnt	AUS Input	Willistown Township Wastewater Assets Detail by Pennoni Associates, Inc.	Eng Assmnt	AUS Input			AUS Input	Col (14) * (15)
NARUC Code	NARUC Code	Asset Description	Original Cost	Cost Index Table	Translator	RCN	COR / RCN Factor	COR
		-				-		
353.20	353.20	Land & Land Rights - Collection System	216.00	USBLS1	1.61	347	644.89	223,776
353.30	353.30	Land & Land Rights - Pumping	21,606.00	USBLS1	4.85	104,817	1.05	109,988
353.40	353.40	Land & Land Rights - Treatment	1,500,007.00	USBLS1	1.30	1,945,510	1.00	1,945,510
354.30	354.30	Stuctures & Improvements - Pumping	2,146,252.31	HWW-18	2.36	5,065,392	1.00	5,065,392
354.40	354.40	Stuctures & Improvements - Treatment	1,448,500.00	HWW-115	2.26	3,275,059	1.00	3,275,059
355.30	355.30	Generating Equipment - Pumping	344,586.01	USBLS4	1.17	401,787	1.00	401,78
360.21	360.21	Collection Sewers - Force - Mains	6,823,585.73	HWW-144	2.18	14,857,717	1.00	14,857,71
361.21	361.21	Collection Sewers - Gravity - Mains	3,807,421.45	HWW-144	3.97	15,110,171	1.00	15,110,17
361.22	361.22	Collection Sewers - Gravity - Mains Relining	956,037.32	HWW-138	1.15	1,096,644	1.00	1,096,644
361.23	361.23	Collection Sewers - Gravity - Manholes	1,562,320.53	HWW-145	3.19	4,989,198	1.00	4,989,19
363.20	363.20	Service Laterals	698,453.71	HWW-139	3.43	2,394,359	1.00	2,394,359
		Grand Total	19,641,519.75		2.53	49,670,307	1.01	49,898,90

These results are detailed in Application **Exhibit R** (AUS Appraisal) under the Cost Approach section.

l		
2	Q.	Under your application of the cost approach, what date did you use for calculating
3		the depreciation or condition of the property?
4	A.	I used the date of January 20, 2021.
5		
6	Q.	How did you determine the depreciation parameters of survival/retirement
7		characteristics and service lives for the utility property under the cost approach?
8	A.	I determined those parameters based on our review of the depreciation studies filed by
9		Pennsylvania-American Water Company ("PAWC") and Aqua Pennsylvania Wastewater,
10		Inc. ("Aqua") in support of their depreciation parameters (Iowa-type Survival
11		Characteristics and Service Lives) and the resultant depreciation expense and rate base (net
12		book) in their recent General Rate Cases (R-2017-2595853, R-2020-3019371 and R-2018-
13		3003561) and AUS Consultants' experience in preparing depreciation studies for the water
14		and wastewater industry and our experience appraising water and wastewater properties.
15		The following table summarizes those studies and AUS Consultants' review of the
16		depreciation parameters:
17		

ccount	Account Description		lowa Curves			Service Life		
		PAWC	PAWC	Aqua	PAWC	PAWC	Aqua	
		12/31/2016	12/31/2019	3/31/2018	12/31/2016	12/31/2019	3/31/2018	
					years	years		
354.20	STRUCTURES AND IMPROVEMENTS - COLLECTION	R3	R3	S0.5	45	45	55	
354.30	STRUCTURES AND IMPROVEMENTS - SPP	R2.5	S0	S1.0	50	55	60	
354.40	STRUCTURES AND IMPROVEMENTS - TDP	R2	S0	R2.0	65	55	50	
354.70	STRUCTURES AND IMPROVEMENTS - GENERAL	S1	S1	R3.0	35	35	50	
355.00	POWER GENERATION EQUIPMENT	R2.5	S0.5		35	35		
360.10	COLLECTION SEWERS - FORCE MAINS	S2	R3	R2.5	70	75	75	
361.10	COLLECTION SEWERS - GRAVITY MAINS	R2.5	R2.5	R2.5	70	80	75	
361.20	MANHOLES	\$1.5	S2.5		50	50		
363.00	SERVICES	R3	R3	R4.0	38	47	70	
364.00	FLOW MEASURING DEVICES	L3	L2.5		20	15		
365.00	FLOW MEASURING INSTALLATIONS	S1.5	S2		30	25		
370.00	RECEIVING WELLS	R3	R3		50	50		
371.00	PUMPING EQUIPMENT	SO	S0.5	L0.5	40	30	25	
380.00	TREATMENT EQUIPMENT	5-R2	S1.5	S0.0	45	35	40	
381.00	PLANT SEWERS	R3	R3	R1.5	50	50	40	
382.00	OUTFALL SEWER LINES	R3	R3	R2.5	50	50	40	
389.10	OTHER PLANT AND MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT - INTANGIBLES	52.5	S2.5		20	20		
389.60	OTHER PLANT AND MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT - CPS	SQ	SQ	L3.0	20	5	20	
390.00	OFFICE FURNITURE AND EQUIPMENT	L4	SQ	SQ	15	20	20	
391.00	TRANSPORTATION EQUIPMENT	SQ	L4		25	14		
392.00	STORES EQUIPMENT	SQ	SQ		20	25		
393.00	TOOLS, SHOP AND GARAGE EQUIPMENT	SQ	SQ	SQ	15	20	20	
394.00	LABORATORY EQUIPMENT	L2.5	SQ	SQ	16	15	25	
395.00	POWER OPERATED EQUIPMENT	SQ	R2		15	22		
396.00	COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT	SQ	SQ		15	15		
397.00	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT		SQ			15		

A.

Q. Why are those parameters appropriate?

Those parameters are appropriate because the parameters reflect the actual service life experienced by PAWC and Aqua both major wastewater utilities serving wastewater customers in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and which were adjudicated by the PUC in PAWC's 2017 General Rate Case, PAWC's 2020 General Rate Case (Docket Nos. R-2020-3019369 and R-2020-30193371, respectively), and Aqua's 2018 General Rate Case (Docket No. R-2018-3003561). The parameters in the following table also reflect AUS Consultants' experience of the survival / retirement characteristics of normal and functional service lives of wastewater properties:

Willistown Township, Pennsylvania Willistown Wastewater Collection System Wastewater Collection System and Treatment Investor-Owned Utility January 20, 2021

Summary of Account Costing and Depreciation Parameters Used in the Depreciation Original Cost and the Depreciated Replacement Cost New Studies

(1)	(2)	(4)		(5)	(6)	
		(4a)	(4b)		(6a)	(6b)
		Iowa				
		Survivor /	Normal			
Account		Retirement	Service	Economic	Tax	
Number	Description	Curve	Life	Obsolescence	Depreciation	
			years	% of CORLD	Table	Life
353.20 Land & L	and Rights - Collection System	ZNonDep	0.00	38.57%	Non-Depr	0.00
353.30 Land & L	and Rights - Pumping	ZNonDep	0.00	38.57%	Non-Depr	0.00
353.40 Land & L	and Rights - Treatment	ZNonDep	0.00	38.57%	Non-Depr	0.00
354.30 Stucture	s & Improvements - Pumping	R4.0	55.00	38.57%	MACRS	25.00
354.40 Stucture	s & Improvements - Treatment	R4.0	55.00	38.57%	MACRS	25.00
355.30 Generat	ing Equipment - Pumping	R3.0	35.00	38.57%	MACRS	25.00
360.21 Collection	on Sewers - Force - Mains	R3.0	75.00	38.57%	MACRS	25.00
361.21 Collection	on Sewers - Gravity - Mains	R2.5	80.00	38.57%	MACRS	25.00
361.22 Collection	on Sewers - Gravity - Mains Relining	R2.5	60.00	38.57%	MACRS	25.00
361.23 Collection	on Sewers - Gravity - Manholes	R2.5	80.00	38.57%	MACRS	25.00
363.20 Service I	aterals	R3.0	70.00	38.57%	MACRS	25.00
364.30 Flow Me	asuring Devices - Pumping	S2.0	25.00	38.57%	MACRS	25.00
390.70 Office Fu	urniture and Equipment	R3.0	15.00	38.57%	MACRS	15.00

2

1

3

4

5

Also, due to the age of Willistown Township's early property installations, the maximum

depreciation was limited to 85% of the cost new.

6

7

- Q. What was the result of the application of the depreciation parameters to the previously described replacement cost new of \$49,898,907?
- 9 **A.** With the application of the above-described depreciation parameters, the replacement cost new of \$49,898,907 results in a replacement cost new less depreciation of \$30,113,231 determined as follows:

	n Wastewater Collection System								
	ter Collection System and Treatment						_		
	Owned Utility								
As of Janu	uary 20, 2021								
Replacem	nent Cost New less Depreciation (RCNLD)								
(18)	(19)	(21)	(22)	(23)	(24)	(28)	(29)	(30)	(31)
Account	Description	Age at January 20, 2021 Appraisal Date	Replacement Cost New (COR)	Retirement Dispersion lowa-type	Normal Service Life (NSL)	Normal Remaining Life	Total Life Expectancy	Condition	Preliminary Cost Approach (COR less Normal Depreciation)
		years	COR \$s		years	years	years	% of COR	CORLD \$s
Input	Input	Calculation	Calculation	Input	Input	Calculation	Calculation	Calculation	Calculation
Eng Assmnt	Willistown Township Wastewater Assets Detail by Pennoni Associates, Inc.		Col (16)	AUS Input	AUS Input		Col (21) + (28)	Col (28) / (29)	Col (22) * (30)
Account	Description	Age	RCN	lowa	NL	Rem Life	Total Life	Condition	CORLD
353.20	Land & Land Rights - Collection System	22.85	223,776	ZNonDep		-			223,770
353.30	Land & Land Rights - Pumping	44.30	109,988	ZNonDep	-	-			109,98
353.40	Land & Land Rights - Treatment	14.50	1,945,510	ZNonDep	-	-		-	1,945,51
354.30	Stuctures & Improvements - Pumping	27.73	5,065,392	R4.0	45.00	20.06	47.78	45.00	2,218,40
354.40	Stuctures & Improvements - Treatment	22.50	3,275,059	R4.0	55.00	32.77	55.27	55.00	1,941,80
355.30	Generating Equipment - Pumping	10.50	401,787	R3.0	35.00	24.95	35.45	35.00	282,78
360.21	Collection Sewers - Force - Mains	24.37	14,857,717	R3.0	75.00	52.04	76.41	75.00	10,144,39
361.21	Collection Sewers - Gravity - Mains	39.95	15,110,171	R2.5	80.00	45.27	85.22	80.00	8,050,17
361.22	Collection Sewers - Gravity - Mains Relining	2.03	1,096,644	R2.5	60.00	57.89	59.92	60.00	1,059,74
361.23	Collection Sewers - Gravity - Manholes	38.82	4,989,198	R2.5	80.00	46.21	85.03	80.00	2,721,30
363.20	Service Laterals	36.39	2,394,359	R3.0	70.00	36.94	73.33	70.00	1,213,39
Grand To	tal	30.28	49,898,907		67.83	41.31	70.83	0.60	30,113,23

This conclusion was tested for economic obsolescence based on the results of the income and market approaches as explained in pages 13-15 of the appraisal report. The results of the income and market approached are described in the remainder of this testimony. Based on our review of the preliminary cost approach and the results of the income and market approaches detailed as follows:

Willistown Wastewater Collection System				
Wastewater Collection System and Treatment				
Investor-Owned Utility				
As of January 20, 2021				
	Column Reference in OCLD & RCNLD	Amount in \$s		
Depreciated Replacement Cost (RCNLD)			18,235,751	Income
Original Cost (OC)	(9)	19,641,520	25,695,620	Market
Replacement Cost New (RCN)	(16)	49,898,907	18,500,000	Conclusion
Replacement Cost New less Depreciation (RCNLD)	(31)	30,113,231	17,500,000	Purchase Price
Intangible Assets - Treatment Contracts				
				Economic
Fair Market Vaue (FMV)	(41)	18,498,555	(11,613,231)	Obsolescence

Therefore, the final cost approach conclusion was determined to be \$18,498,555 as follows:

Willistown	Wastewater Collection System			
	er Collection System and Treatment			
	wned Utility			
	uary 20, 2021			
	,			
Fair Marke	et Value			
(36)	(37)	(39)	(40)	(41)
Account	Description	Preliminary Cost Approach	Economic Obsolescence	Fair Market Value
		CORLD \$s	% of Preliminary Cost Approach	Appraisal Date Value \$s
Input	Input	Calculation	Input	Calculation
Eng Assmnt	Eng Assmnt	Col (31)	AUS Economic Obsolescence Analysis	(39) * [1.00-Col (40)]
Account	Description	Prelim CORLD	EO%	FMV
353.20	Land & Land Rights - Collection System	222 776	38.57%	127 463
353.20	Land & Land Rights - Conection System Land & Land Rights - Pumping	223,776 109,988	38.57%	137,463 67,563
353.40	Land & Land Rights - Pumping Land & Land Rights - Treatment	1,945,510	38.57%	1,195,128
354.30	Stuctures & Improvements - Pumping	2,218,402	38.57%	1,362,766
354.40	Stuctures & Improvements - Treatment	1,941,807	38.57%	1,192,85
355.30	Generating Equipment - Pumping	282,781	38.57%	173,71
360.21	Collection Sewers - Force - Mains	10,144,396	38.57%	6,231,70
361.21	Collection Sewers - Gravity - Mains	8,050,177	38.57%	4,945,22
361.22	•	1,059,746	38.57%	651,00
361.23	Collection Sewers - Gravity - Manholes	2,721,303	38.57%	1,671,69
363.20	Service Laterals	1,213,391	38.57%	745,386
	Grand Total	30,113,231	38.57%	18,498,55

1		These results are detailed in Application Exhibit R (AUS Appraisal) under the Cost
2		Approach section.
3		
4	Marl	ket Approach
5	Q.	Regarding your application of the market approach, what methods did you use to
6		determine the market approach result?
7	A.	I used the comparable sales of water and wastewater properties in the Commonwealth of
8		Pennsylvania subsequent to the passage of Section 1329 and financial market value ratios
9		of publicly traded water and wastewater companies as reported in the January 8, 2021,
10		issue of Value Line Investment Survey.
11		
12	Q.	What assumptions, analyses, and/or adjustments did you make under each method?
13	A.	Under the comparable sales method, it is my opinion that sales amount to depreciated
14		replacement cost is the best indicator in arriving at the appraised value of physical assets
15		operating as a wastewater collection system. Under the financial ratios method, I believe
16		that an accurate result depends on using the weighted mean of the ratio of the market debt
17		and equity to book debt and equity.
18		
19	Q.	What were the results of each analysis you performed?
20	A.	The comparable sales analysis produced a result of \$25,695,620 detailed as follows:

Willistown Wastewater Collection System					
Wastewater Collection System and Treatment					
Investor-Owned Utility					
As of January 20, 2021					
,					
Comparable Sales Approach					
Market Sales Data					
Central Tendancy and Reliability Analysis					
Market Sales Analysis - PP/OCLD			Market Sales Analysis - PP/CORLD		
Simple	Weighted		Simple	Weighted	
Mean 1.7594	1.8494		Mean 0.8087		
Standard Deviation 0.5882	0.5292		Standard Deviation 0.1746		
Median 1.49	1.4375		Median 0.8229		
Mode 1.4418	1.4418		Mode 0.6918	0.6918	
Conclusion	1.8494	ALIS Input	Conclusion	0.8533	AUS Inpu
Conclusion	1.0454	AOS IIIput	Conclusion	0.8333	Aosinpu
		Cost			Cost
		Approach -	Willistown Wastewater Collection System		Approach
Willistown Wastewater Collection System OCLD	13,524,101	OCLD	CORLD	30,113,231	CORLD
Market Value Indication	25,011,472		Market Value Indication	25,695,620	
Market Sales Analysis - PP/Customer			Financial Basis ¹		
				Market Value per	
	14/-1 1 - 1		Flores and Administration	Share to Book	
Simple	Weighted		Financial Markets	Value per Share	
Water & Wastewater Industryn	10.000				
Mean 7,963 Standard Deviation 3,637	10,962				
	4,613				
Median 8,315	4,963				
Mode 7,243 Water Tretment & Distribution	7,243				
Mean 6,123			Market to Book (equity)	3.40	
Standard Deviation			Market to Book (equity) Market to Book (equity)	2.11	
Median 5,021			warket to book (equity and debt)	2.11	
Wastewater Collection & Treatment			Use (equity and debt)	2.11	AUS Inpu
Mean 9,579					
Standard Deviation	-	AUS Input			
Median 8,754					
Wastewater Collection					
Mean 6,507					
Standard Deviation					
Median 6,636					
Watewater Treatment Only					
Mean 3,072					
Standard Deviation					
Median 2,118					· ·
Willistown Wastewater Collection System			Willistown Wastewater Collection System		Cost Approach
Customers	2,294	AUS Input	Willistown Wastewater Collection System OCLD	13,524,101	OCLD
Wastewater Collection & Treatment PP/Customer	9,579	AUS Input	CCLD	13,324,101	OCLD
Collection and Treatement Customers Market Value II	21,974,226	Aos input	Market Value Indication	28,535,853	
and the state of t	,_,_,_			20,000,000	
Treatement Only Market Value Indication					
Treatment Only PP/customer	2,118	AUS Input			
Treatment Only Customers	-	AUS Input			
Market Value Indication Treatment Only	-	,			
Total Market Value Indication	21,974,226				
Market Sales Analysis - PP/Cash Flows (EBITDA Period			Market Sales Analysis - PP/Cash Flows (EBITDA		
Simple	Weighted		Simple	Weighted	
Mean 17.48	15.32		Mean 11.62	11.45	
Standard Deviation 5.71	5.10		Standard Deviation 2.67	2.14	
Median 17.41	18.13		Median 11.65	12.07	
Mode 10.68	10.68		Mode 9.55	9.55	
Forecast	40.00	ALICIE	Forecast	10.5	ALIC:
Conclusion	18.00	AUS Input	Conclusion	12.00	AUS Inpu
Willistown Wastewater Collection System Cock		Income	Willistown Wastewater Collection System		Income
Willistown Wastewater Collection System Cash Flows	892,978	Income Approach	Cash Flows	1,168,600	Approach
IIOW3	092,978	Approach	Casti i IUWS	1,100,000	Whiteger
Market Value Indication	16,073,611			14,023,202	
Summary of Market Analyses					
Indicators					
OCLD	25,011,472				
CORLD	25,695,620				
Customers	21,974,226				
Cash Flows					
EBITDA Periods 1-5	16,073,611				
	14,023,202				
EBITDA Periods 1-13	14,023,202				
EBITDA Periods 1-13 Value Line	28,535,853				
Value Line	28,535,853				
Value Line Mean	28,535,853 21,885,664				
Value Line	28,535,853				

1		
2	Q.	What was your market approach result?
3	A.	I used the results of \$25,695,620 because I believe those results represent an accurate
4		assessment and it was based on the relationship of market comparable sales to the
5		replacement cost new less depreciation of those properties. These results are detailed in
6		Application Exhibit R (AUS Appraisal) under the Market Approach section.
7		
8	Q.	What was the calculation you used to determine your overall market approach
9		results?
10	A.	I used the weighted mean of the purchase price to replacement cost less depreciation.
11		
12	Q.	What comparable transactions or comparable sales did you evaluate to develop your
13		market approach?
14	A.	I examined the following transactions to develop the result of my market approach:
15		

		wnship, Pennsylvania astewater Collection !							
	Wastewater C	ollection System and							
	Investor-Own								
	As of January 2								
	Comparable Sa	ales Approach							
	Market Sales [Data							
RowID	Approximate Date	Buyer	Seller	County	Type of Facility Wastewater	Initial Purchase Price	Final Purchase Price ¹	Number of Total Customers	Relationship t the passage o Section 1329
	0/1/2016	DA A	City of Mal/account	Allaskası	Collection and	456,000,000	150 000 000	24.052	Doot
1	9/1/2016	PA American Water	City of McKeesport	Allegheny	Treatment	156,000,000	159,000,000	21,953	Post
					Wastewater Collection and Paid for and Owned				
2	8/1/2016	Aqua PA	New Garden Twp. SA	Chester	Treatment	29,500,000	29,500,000	2,106	Post
					Wastewater				
3	11/16/2016	Agua PA	Limerick Township	Montgomery	Collection and Treatment System	75,100,000	64,373,378	5,434	Post
,	11/10/2010	Aquai A	Emerick rownship	Workgomery	Wastewater	73,100,000	04,373,370	3,434	1 030
4	12/10/2017	Agua PA	East Bradford Township	Chester	Collection and paid for treatment	5,000,000	5,000,000	1,248	Post
	,,					5,555,555	-,,	_,	
5	4/20/2018	SUEZ	Mahoning	Carbon	Water Distribution System	4,734,800	4,734,800	1,186	Post
					Wastewater				
6	4/20/2018	SUEZ	Mahoning	Carbon	Collection	4,765,200	4,765,200	1,451	Post
					Wastewater				
7	6/1/2018	Aqua PA	Cheltenham	Montgomery	Collection	50,250,000	50,250,000	10,500	Post
					Water Distribution				
8	11/14/2018	PA American Water	Steelton	Dauphin	and Treatment	22,500,000	21,750,000	2,325	Post
	4 /4 /2047		6.11		Wastewater	0.250.000	0.000.000	000	
9	1/1/2017	PA American Water	Sadsbury	Chester	Collection Wastewater	9,250,000	8,600,000	998	Post
10	5/28/2018	PA American Water	Exeter	Berks	Collection and Treatment	96,000,000	93,500,000	9,000	Post
						.,,.	,,	1,	
4.4	10/20/22:5	A D.1	Fort November	Mani	Wastewater	04 000 01	24 000 00		
11	10/29/2018	AquaPA	East Norriton	Montgomery	Collection Wastewater	21,000,000	21,000,000	4,950	Post
					Collection and				
12	9/30/2018	PA American	Kane	McKean	Treatment	17,560,000	17,560,000	2,006	Post
					Wastewater Collection and				
13	12/10/2019	PA American	Royersford	Montgomery	Collection and Treatment	13,000,000	13,000,000	1,596	Post
_	, 22, 2020		,	gomery	Water Treatment	,500,000	.,223,000	_,555	
	42/47/22:5	DA A :	Malla	Chart	and Distribution	7.007.00	7 005 005		
14	12/17/2019	PA American	Valley	Chester	System	7,325,000	7,325,000	1,459	Post
15	12/17/2019	PA American	Valley	Chester	Wastewater Collection System	13,950,000	13,950,000	1,644	Post
16	12/31/2019	Aqua PA	Delaware County Regional	\Delaware	Wastewater Collection and Treatment	276,500,000	276,500,000	16,473	Post
					Wastewater				
17	4/28/2020	PA American Water	Upper Pottsgrove	Montgomery		13,750,000	13,750,000	1,428	Post
_,	.,,,	The state of the s		gomery	Wastewater Collection and	_5,750,000	22,: 30,000	2, .20	. 000

1		
2	Inco	me Approach
3	Q.	Regarding your application of the income approach, what method did you use to
4		determine the income approach result?
5	A.	I used the discounted cash flow method.
6		
7	Q.	What assumptions did you employ to develop your income approach result?
8	Α.	Under the income approach, it is my opinion that the results of the future operations of the
9		Willistown Township's Wastewater Collection and Treatment System must be considered.
10		I believe that an accurate result depends on adjusting recent results of the systems operation
11		to better reflect how those results will migrate over future periods under the operation as a
12		rate regulated wastewater system regulated by the PUC.
13		
14	Q.	What discount rate did you use to calculate your income approach?
15	A.	I used a discount rate of 7.57% and a capitalization rate of 5.65%.
16		
17	Q.	Please explain how you developed the discount rate.
18	A.	In each case, the discount rate was a market discount rate at the appraisal date and was
19		determined using the weighted average cost of capital ("WACC") of both debt and equity.
20		The inputs to the WACC determination, capital structure, cost of debt, cost of equity, and
21		income tax rate (state and federal) were determined based on an analysis of Value Line
22		Investment Surveys and the Ibbotson Stock, Bonds, Bills, and Inflation ("Ibbotson SBBI")
23		2021 Edition (SBBI activity over the period 1926 through 2020). The cost of debt was

determined at January 1, 2021, based on the Value Line Selected Yields publication. The
cost of equity was based on the capital asset pricing model ("CAPM") and the Dividend
Growth Model ("DGM"), two recognized cost of equity estimating models and the PUC's
Bureau of Technical Utility Services' Report on Quarterly Earnings of Jurisdictional
Utilities for Year-ending December 31, 2020. The above-described data for the Willistown
Township appraisal can be found in the exhibits to my appraisal report in the section
entitled Cost of Capital / Required Return.

- Q. What capital structure inputs differ from those identified in capital structure set forth earlier in your testimony?
- A. None. As described in the previous discussion of the capital structure, we utilized a market required capital structure based on analysis of the water / wastewater industry's market capital structure as defined by analysis of market financials as published in Value Line Investment Survey (January 1, 2021). The theory in appraisal is to estimate the value of a property in an arm's length transaction wherein the purchaser finances the purchase with capital (debt and equity) available in the financial markets at the appraisal date. Those are the current (appraisal date) financial markets.

- Q. What is the source and basis of the alternative input you propose in the income approach?
- As discussed above, we had used Value Line Investment Survey to develop a market required capital structure. Please see Application **Exhibit R** (AUS Appraisal) Income

1		Approach section for the cost of capital of the Income Approach and Cost of Capital
2		Required Return section for the basis of the Cost of Capital / Required Return.
3		
4	Q.	If you used a terminal value in your discounted cash flow analysis what is the number
5		of years over which the cash flows are considered?
6	Α.	I considered those cash flows over 19 periods with period 20 representing all future periods.
7		
8	Q.	What is the basis for using this number of years?
9	A.	It is my opinion that the use of 19 periods is a reasonable number of periods for the forecast
10		revenues and expenses to stabilize.
11		
12	Q.	What is your Income Approach conclusion?
13	A.	AUS Consultants' income approach conclusion was determined to be \$18,235,751 detailed
14		as follows:
15		

					,	Willistown Wast	ownship, Penns tewater Collect						
						stewater Colle							
					P	otential Purcha							
							January 20, 202						
						Discounted	Cash Flow An	alysis					
Discount R	ate:		7.57%										
Capitalizati	on Rate:		5.65%										
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)
Period	Age	Revenues	O&M Expenses	Tax Depreciation	Cash Flow from Operations	Taxable Income before State & Federal Taxes	State and Federal Taxes @ 28.89%	Capital Expenditures	Change in Working Capital	Net Cash Flows	Period Present Worth Factor (PW)	PW of Cashflow	Accumulated PW of Cashflows
					(3)-(4)	(6)-(5)	(7) *28.89%			(3)-(4)-(8)-(9)-(10)		(11)*(12)	Sum (13)
1	0.5	2,659,679	1,833,318	773,554	826,361	52,807	15,256	417,347		393,758	0.964		379,583
2	1.5	2,659,679	1,869,985	782,619	789,694	7,075	2,044	420,814		366,836	0.896		708,268
3	2.5	3,457,583	1,907,385	791,937	1,550,198	758,261	219,062	424,334	43,086	863,716	0.833		1,427,743
4	3.5	3,457,583	1,945,533	801,513	1,512,050	710,537	205,274	427,902	-	878,874	0.775		2,108,870
5	4.5	3,457,583	1,984,444	811,355	1,473,139	661,784	191,190	431,525		850,424	0.720		2,721,175
6	5.5	4,149,100	2,024,133	821,467	2,124,967	1,303,500	376,581	435,202	37,342	1,275,842	0.669		3,574,713
7	6.5	4,149,100	2,064,616	800,818	2,084,484	1,283,666	370,851	319,482	-	1,394,151	0.622	867,162	4,441,875
8	7.5	4,149,100	2,105,908	808,887	2,043,192	1,234,305	356,591	322,486	-	1,364,115	0.579	789,823	5,231,698
9	8.5	4,564,010	2,148,026	817,198	2,415,984	1,598,786	461,889	325,541	22,406	1,606,148	0.538	864,108	6,095,806
10	9.5	4,564,010	2,190,987	825,760	2,373,023	1,547,263	447,004	328,654	-	1,597,365	0.500	798,683	6,894,489
11	10.5	4,564,010	2,234,806	834,578	2,329,204	1,494,626	431,797	331,824	-	1,565,583	0.465	727,996	7,622,485
12	11.5	4,837,851	2,279,503	843,663	2,558,348	1,714,685	495,373	335,055	14,787	1,713,133	0.432	740,073	8,362,558
13	12.5	4,837,851	2,325,093	853,018	2,512,758	1,659,740	479,499	338,345		1,694,914	0.402	681,355	9,043,913
14	13.5	4,837,851	2,371,595	862,653	2,466,256	1,603,603	463,281	341,698	-	1,661,277	0.373	619,656	9,663,569
15	14.5	5,128,122	2,419,027	872,580	2,709,095	1,836,515	530,569	345,119	15,674	1,817,733	0.347	630,753	10,294,322
16	15.5	5,128,122	2,467,408	771,844	2,660,714	1,888,870	545,694	348,603		1,766,417	0.323	570,553	10,864,875
17	16.5	5,128,122	2,516,756	778,275	2,611,366	1,833,091	529,580	352,158	-	1,729,628	0.300	518,888	11,383,763
18	17.5	5,435,809	2,567,092	784,893	2,868,717	2,083,824	602,017	355,784	16,616	1,894,300	0.279	528,510	11,912,273
19	18.5	5,435,809	2,618,434	791,709	2,817,375	2,025,666	585,215	359,487	-	1,872,673	0.259	485,022	12,397,295
20 and													
beyond	19.5	5,435,809	2,670,802	798,726	2,765,007	1,966,281	568,058	363,263 7,324,623		1,833,686	3.184	5,838,456	18,235,751
Age				19.5	i			7,52 1,625					
PW(Age) =	1/(1+Disc	count Rate)(Age)		0.241				Net Plant		15,660,079			
PW to Perp	etuity = 1	L/Capitalization I	Rate	13.210)			ADIT		(2,040,733)			
PW	= PW/t	to Perpetuity * P	W Factor	3.184				Rate Base		13,619,346	0.241	3,282,262	15,679,557
20and Bey	ona)		(19.5)					Annual Plant Construction				5,252,252	
								Inflation Rate		0.0422	Input		
								Plant Inflation over 19.5 years		31,129,893	0.241	7,502,304	19,899,599
								PP	17,500,000				
								OCLD	13,524,101				
								PP/OCLD	1.294				
								RCNLD	30,113,231				
								RCNLD/PP		1.720756057			
										23,435,572.16	0.241	5,647,973	18,045,268
													47.005.00
								Average					17,965,0

These results are detailed in Application **Exhibit R** (AUS Appraisal) under the Income Approach section.

Q. What number of Selling Utility customers or equivalent dwelling units did you use to value the Seller's system and how did you develop that number?

1	A.	I used 2,294 customers based on a customer count provided by Willistown Township in
2		developing the forecasted revenues and expenses. I also used past and budgeted results
3		from operations to establish forecasted operating results.
4		
5	Q.	Did you make any updates to your appraisal after it was submitted to the Seller, and
6		if so, what was the update, when was it made, and why was it necessary?
7	A.	No.
8		
9	Q.	Does this conclude your direct testimony?
10	A.	It does. However, by filing this direct testimony I understand that I may have the
11		opportunity to submit additional testimony responsive to challenges to my appraisal.

Curriculum Vitae (CV) of Jerome C. Weinert, P.E., CDP, ASA

Mr. Weinert is currently Principal and Director of AUS Consultants, Depreciation and Valuation. He has forty-nine (2021-1972) years' experience in valuation and depreciation consulting and management. AUS, with offices across the country, has provided consulting services to the regulated utility industry nationally for over thirty-nine years. A partial list of services provided includes valuations depreciation studies, rate of return studies, cost of service studies, and rate design.

Prior to joining AUS in 1987, Mr. Weinert was employed by American Appraisal Associates, Inc. (American) for sixteen years in their Regulated Industries Group. He held various positions at American, the last being supervising appraiser. Among his other valuation responsibilities, he directed the firm's utility industry capital recovery studies and AUS Consultant's valuation of communication company assets and businesses.

Mr. Weinert graduated from the Milwaukee School of Engineering with a Bachelor of Science degree in Mechanical Engineering and received a master's in business administration from Marquette University. He is a registered professional engineer (1976) (by examination) in the state of Wisconsin as well as a senior member (1982) of the American Society of Appraisers in the public utility valuation field. This latter designation is obtained by written examination primarily in the areas of utility valuation, depreciation, and the economics of regulated firms. He is also a Certified Depreciation Professional (1997) (CDP) and founding member of the Society of Depreciation Professionals and the Society's 1995 President and sponsor of the Society's Certification and re-certification program as such Mr. Weinert developed these programs and oversaw their initial introduction into the Society. He also worked in conjunction with Society members in the development of the Society's training programs which as of 2003 has become the only such formalized depreciation training program in the North America and is an instructor in several of its courses.

During his professional career related to valuations and depreciation matters Mr. Weinert has testified before various courts and public service commissions on these subjects. He has also assisted numerous utilities in preparing capital recovery plans which specifically address the issues of plant replacement. Mr. Weinert has also presented expert testimony on valuation matters. Mr. Weinert has testified before the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission on regulatory matters associated with Pennsylvania Section 1329 matters. On matters related to eminent domain issues, Mr. Weinert has presented expert testimony in the Massachusetts Superior Court, the Court of Common Pleas, Fayette County, Ohio, the New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission, the Twentieth Judicial Court (deposition only) in Charlotte County. Florida, the Nineteenth Judicial Circuit Court in St. Lucie County, Florida (deposition only). In regard to ad valorem taxation, Mr. Weinert has presented study results to the New York State Board of Equalization and Assessment (now the New York Office of Real Property Services (NY ORPS)), pertaining to useful life and net salvage values for all types of utility property subject to the Board's mass appraisal model. Mr. Weinert has appeared before the Valuation Adjustment Board in Florida for Duval, Hillsborough, Okeechobee, and Palm Beach counties, the Twelfth Judicial Circuit Sarasota County, Florida, the California Board of Equalization and Assessment, the Arizona Board of Assessment, the Missouri Board of Taxation, the Colorado and Texas Departments of Review, the Massachusetts Tax Appeal Court, the Superior Court of the State of Arizona in the County of Maricopa, the State Tax Appeal Board of the State of Montana, the New York City Tax Commission and the Public Utility Commission of Pennsylvania Section 1329 hearings (8).

Mr. Weinert has appeared before regulatory bodies in Alaska, Arkansas, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Missouri, Nevada, Nebraska, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and South Carolina in support of rate-base valuation determination and capital recovery. He has presented testimony on depreciation matters before the Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC) and the United

QUALIFICATIONS 1

States Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). In terms of water and wastewater acquisitions and applications for regulatory approval of rate base Mr. Weinert has testified for two investor-owned acquisitions of municipal wastewater authorities one representing the municipality and secondly for the acquiring investor-owned utility. He has submitted study results to the State Commissions of Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Washington, and Wisconsin, and the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. Weinert has presented papers on valuation and depreciation topics to professional and utility industry trade organizations. He also directed AUS Consultants' semi-annual week-long depreciation training programs (1988-1997). These specialized training courses, offered at basic and advanced levels, teach depreciation study techniques to public utility and public service commission staff specialists. The training includes depreciation theory and concepts and hands-on experience with personal computer-based analytical depreciation programs.

Page 3

Company	Proporty		Study Year	Year Performed	Activity
Company	<u>Property</u>		<u>i eai</u>	<u> Performed</u>	Activity
2021					
AT&T Communications	North America	2020		2021	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications	California	2020		2021	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications	Florida	2020		2021	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Business (formerly MCI)	North America	2020		2021 2021	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Fair Market Value 1329
Lower Makefield, PA Cozen O'Connor	Lower Makefield Wastewate Egg Harbor, NJ Water &	er202 i		2021	Fair Market Value 1329
Cozen o Connor	Wastewater	2021		2021	Fair Market Value
	Wastewater	2021		2021	Tall Market Value
2020	.	0040		0000	A 11/1 - T A
AT&T Communications	North America	2019		2020	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications	California	2019		2020	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications	Florida Indiana	2019 2019		2020 2020	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Indiana Bell Telephone Company Verizon New York, Inc.	New York	2019		2020	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Business (formerly MCI)	North America	2019		2020	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
East Norriton Township, PA	East Norriton Wastewater	2019		2020	Fair Market Value 1329
Pennsylvania American Water Company	Kane Wastewater	2019		2020	Fair Market Value 1329
Pennsylvania American Water Company	Royersford Wastewater	2019		2020	Fair Market Value 1329
Pennsylvania American Water Company	Valley Wastewater	2019		2020	Fair Market Value 1329
Pennsylvania American Water Company	Valley Water	2019		2020	Fair Market Value 1329
Lehigh County Authority	Allentown Water & Sewer	2020		2020	Financing
Pennsylvania American Water Company	Upper Pottsgrove wastewa	ter2020		2020	Fair Market Value 1329
2019					
AT&T Communications	North America	2018		2019	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications	California	2018		2019	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications	Florida	2018		2019	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Indiana Bell Telephone Company	Indiana	2018		2019	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Embarq Florida, Inc.	Florida	2018		2019	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Business (formerly MCI)	North America	2018		2019	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Cheltenham Township, PA	Cheltenham Wastewater	2018		2019	Fair Market Value 1329
Pennsylvania American Water Company	Steelton Water	2018		2019	Fair Market Value 1329
Pennsylvania American Water Company	Exeter Wastewater	2018		2019	Fair Market Value 1329
2018					
AT&T Communications	North America	2017		2018	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications	California	2017		2018	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications	Florida	2017		2018	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Indiana Bell Telephone Company	Indiana	2017		2018	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Embarq Florida, Inc.	Florida	2017		2018	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Business (formerly MCI)	North America	2017		2018	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Level 3 Communications, LLC	North America	2017		2018	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Level 3 Communications, LLC	California	2017		2018	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
CenturyLink Communications, LLC	North America	2017		2018	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
CenturyLink Communications, LLC	California	2017		2018	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
East Bradford Township, PA	East Bradford Wastewater	2018 2017		2018 2018	Fair Market Value 1329 Fair Market Value Appraisal
Pennsylvania American Water Company	Sadsbury Wastewater	2011		2010	i ali iviainet value Appiaisai

QUALIFICATIONS 3

CV of Weinert

Page 4

Appraisal & Capital Recovery Activities Client List

Company	Property		Study Year	Year <u>Performed</u>	Activity
Pennsylvania American Water Company Appraisal	Kane Wastewater	2017		2018	Fair Market Value
2017 AT&T Communications AT&T Communications AT&T Communications AT&T - Indiana Bell Telephone Company Embarq Florida, Inc. Verizon Communications Verizon Business (formerly MCI) Level 3 Communications Level 3 Communications Whitpain Township, PA Plymouth Township, PA East Norriton Township, PA Pennsylvania American Water Company	North America California Florida Indiana Florida Florida North America North America California Whitpain Wastewater Plymouth Wastewater East Norriton Wastewater Sadsbury Wastewater	2016 2016 2016 2016 2016 2016 2016 2016		2017 2017 2017 2017 2017 2017 2017 2017	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Appraisal for Planning Appraisal for Planning Appraisal for Planning Fair Market Value Appraisal
Pennsylvania American Water Company Intermountain Gas Company 2016	McKeesport Wastewater Idaho	2016 2016		2017 2017	Fair Market Value Appraisal Depreciation Study
AT&T Communications AT&T Communications AT&T Communications AT&T - Indiana Bell Telephone Company Embarq Florida, Inc. Verizon Communications Verizon Business (formerly MCI) Level 3 Communications Level 3 Communications New Garden Township, PA	North America California Florida Indiana Florida Florida North America North America, California New Garden Wastewater	2015 2015 2015 2015 2015 2015 2015 2015		2016 2016 2016 2016 2016 2016 2016 2016	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Fair Market Value Appraisal
2015 AT&T Communications AT&T Communications AT&T Communications AT&T Communications AT&T - Indiana Bell Telephone Company Embarq Florida, Inc. Verizon Communications Verizon Business (formerly MCI) Level 3 Communications Level 3 Communications Verizon Wireless	North America California Florida Indiana Florida Florida North America North America, California Nationwide	2014 2014 2014 2014 2014 2014 2014 2014		2015 2015 2015 2015 2015 2015 2015 2015	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
2014 AT&T Communications AT&T Communications AT&T Communications AT&T - Indiana Bell Telephone Company	North America California Florida Indiana	2013 2013 2013 2013		2014 2014 2014 2014	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal

QUALIFICATIONS 4

Page 5

Company	Property	Study Year	Year Performed	Activity
<u>Company</u>	Property	Teal	Periorinea	<u>ACTIVITY</u>
Embarq Florida, Inc.	Florida	2013	2014	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	Florida	2013	2014	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Business (formerly MCI)	North America	2013	2014	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Level 3 Communications	North America,	2013	2014	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Level 3 Communications	California	2013	2014	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Cascade Natural Gas Corporation Intermountain Gas Company	Oregon & Washington Idaho	2013 2013	2014 2014	Depreciation Study Depreciation Study
Virgin Islands Telephone Corporation	US Virgin Islands	2013	2014	Depreciation Study
Verizon Wireless	Nationwide	2013	2014	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
2013				
AT&T Communications	North America	2012	2012	Ad Valorom Toy Approisal
AT&T Communications AT&T Communications	North America California	2012 2012	2013 2013	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications AT&T Communications	Florida	2012	2013	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications AT&T - Indiana Bell Telephone Company	Indiana	2012	2013	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Michigan Bell Telephone Company	Michigan	2012	2013	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Embarq Florida, Inc.	Florida	2012	2013	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	Florida	2012	2013	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	New England - Mass	2012	2013	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Business (formerly MCI)	North America	2012	2013	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Level 3 Communications	North America, California	2012	2013	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Sprint Nextel Corporation	North America	2012	2013	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Wireless	Palm Beach, Florida	2012	2013	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	New England Mass	2002-2007	2013	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
2012				
AT&T Communications	North America	2011	2012	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications	California	2011	2012	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications	Florida	2011	2012	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Indiana Bell Telephone Company	Indiana	2011	2012	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Michigan Bell Telephone Company	Michigan	2011	2012	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Embarq Florida, Inc.	Florida	2011	2012	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications Verizon Communications	Florida New England - Mass	2011 2011	2012 2012	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Business (formerly MCI)	North America	2011	2012	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Level 3 Communications	North America,	2011	2012	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
	California			
Sprint Nextel Corporation	North America	2011	2012	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Wireless	Palm Beach, Florida	2011	2012	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
MetroPCS	Palm Beach, Florida	2011	2012	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Wireless	Florida - revised Palm Beach, Florida	2008	2012	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Wireless	r aiiii Deavii, Fluilua	2012	2012	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
2011				
AT&T Communications	North America	2010	2011	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications	California	2010	2011	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications	Florida	2010	2011	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Indiana Bell Telephone Company AT&T - Michigan Bell Telephone Company	Indiana Michigan	2010 2010	2011 2011	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
ATAT - Michigan Deli Telephone Company	wholigan	2010	2011	
				QUALIFICATIONS 5

CV of Weinert

Page 6

Appraisal & Capital Recovery Activities Client List

Company	Property		Study Year	Year <u>Performed</u>	Activity
			<u>i cai</u>		
Embarq Florida, Inc.	Florida	2010		2011	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	Florida	2010		2011	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	New England - Mass	2010		2011	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Business (formerly MCI)	North America	2010		2011	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Level 3 Communications	North America, California	2010		2011	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Global Crossing	North America	2010		2011	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Intermountain Gas Company	Idaho	2010		2011	Depreciation Study
Sprint Nextel Corporation	North America	2010		2011	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Wireless	Palm Beach, Florida	2010		2011	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
MetroPCS	Palm Beach, Florida	2010		2011	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	Florida - revised	2008		2011	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Intermountain Gas Company	Idaho	2010		2011	Depreciation Study
Virgin Islands Telephone Corporation	US Virgin Islands	2010		2011	Technical Update of Depreciation
				Study	
2010	N. (1. A	2222		0010	
AT&T Communications	North America	2009		2010	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications	California	2009		2010	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications	Florida	2009		2010	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Indiana Bell Telephone Company	Indiana	2009		2010	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Michigan Bell Telephone Company	Michigan	2009		2010	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Southwestern Bell Telephone Compar		2009		2010	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Arkansas, Kansas, Missouri, Oklaho	ma, rexas Florida	2009		2010	Ad Valerem Tay Appreied
Embarg Florida, Inc.	Missouri	2009		2010	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Embarq Missouri, Inc. Verizon Communications	Florida	2009		2010	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications Verizon Communications		2009		2010	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications Verizon Communications	Northwest	2009		2010	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
	New England - Mass	2009		2010	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Business (formerly MCI) Level 3 Communications	North America North America,	2009		2010	
	California				Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Global Crossing	North America	2009		2010	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
MetroPCS	Palm Beach, Florida	2009		2010	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
2009					
AT&T Communications	North America	2008		2009	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications	California	2008		2009	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications	Florida	2008		2009	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Indiana Bell Telephone Company	Indiana	2008		2009	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Michigan Bell Telephone Company	Michigan	2008		2009	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Wisconsin Bell Telephone Company	Wisconsin	2008		2009	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Southwestern Bell Telephone Compar		2008		2009	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Arkansas, Kansas, Missouri, Oklaho		0000		0000	A 137.1 - A
Embarq Florida, Inc.	Florida	2008		2009	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Embarq Texas, Inc.	Texas	2008		2009	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Embarq Missouri, Inc.	Missouri	2008		2009	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Embarq Northwest	Washington	2008		2009	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Embarq Virginia	Virginia	2008		2009	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal

QUALIFICATIONS 6

Page 7

Appraisal & Capital Recovery Activities Client List

Company	Property	Study Year	Year Performed	Activity
Company	Troperty	<u> </u>	<u>r errormeu</u>	Activity
Verizon Communications	Florida	2008	2009	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	Northwest	2008	2009	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	New England - Mass	2008	2009	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Business (formerly MCI)	North America	2008	2009	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Level 3 Communications	North America,	2008	2009	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
	California, Michigan & Ariz	ona		
Global Crossing	North America	2008	2009	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AboveNet, Inc	North America/California	2003	2009	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Wireless	Ohio Properties	2004-2005	2009	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Virgin Islands Telephone Corporation	US Virgin Islands	2008	2009	Depreciation Study
Sprint Nextel Corporation	North America	2008	2009	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
- 1				11
2008				
AT&T Communications	North America	2007	2008	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications	California	2007	2008	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Indiana Bell Telephone Company	Indiana	2007	2008	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Michigan Bell Telephone Company	Michigan	2007	2008	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Wisconsin Bell Telephone Company	Wisconsin	2007	2008	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Southwestern Bell Telephone Compan	У	2007	2008	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
·	Arkansas, Kansas, Missou	ri, Oklahoma, Texas	3	
Embarq Florida, Inc.	Florida	2007	2008	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Embarq Texas, Inc.	Texas	2007	2008	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Embarq Missouri, Inc.	Missouri	2007	2008	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Embarq Northwest	Washington	2007	2008	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Embarq Virginia	Virginia	2007	2008	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	Florida	2007	2008	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	California	2007	2008	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	Northwest	2007	2008	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	New England Mass	2002-2007	2008	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Business (formerly MCI)	North America	2007	2008	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Level 3 Communications	North America,	2007	2008	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
	California, Michigan & Arizo	ona		••
Global Crossing	North America	2007	2007	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Intermountain Gas Company	Idaho	2007	2008	Depreciation Study
2007				
AT&T Communications	North America	2006	2007	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications	California	2006	2007	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Indiana Bell Telephone Company	Indiana	2006	2007	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Michigan Bell Telephone Company	Michigan	2006	2007	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Wisconsin Bell Telephone Company	Wisconsin	2006	2007	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Embarq Florida, Inc.	Florida	2006	2007	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Embarq Texas, Inc.	Texas,	2006	2007	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Embarq Missouri, Inc.	Missouri	2006	2007	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Embarq North Carolina	North Carolina	2006	2007	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Embarq Virginia	Virginia	2006	2007	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	Florida	2006	2007	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	California	2006	2007	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	Northwest	2006	2007	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Business (formerly MCI)	North America	2006	2007	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Qwest Communications Corporation	North America	2006	2007	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
- 1				QUALIFICATIONS 7

Page 8

Appraisal & Capital Recovery Activities Client List

Company	Proporty	Study Year	Year Performed	Activity
Company	Property	ieai_	Periorified	Activity
	California			
Level 3 Communications	North America, California, Michigan, & Ariz	2006 cona	2007	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Level 3 Communications	Arizona	2002 - 2006	2007	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Global Crossing	North America	2006	2007	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Alaska Communications System, Inc.	ACS of Alaska	2006	2007	Depreciation Studies
(ACS)	ACS of Anchorage ACS of Fairbanks			
	ACS of the Northland			
	ACS Holdings			
Intermountain Gas Company	Idaho	2006	2007	Depreciation Study
2006				
AT&T Communications	Palm Beach Florida	2000 - 2003	2006	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications	North America	2005	2006	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications	California	2005	2006	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Sprint Florida, Inc.	Florida	2005	2006	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Sprint Texas, Inc.	Texas,	2005	2006	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Sprint Missouri, Inc. Sprint North Carolina	Missouri North Carolina	2005 2005	2006 2006	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Sprint Virginia	Virginia	2005	2006	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Embarg Nevada	Nevada	2005	2006	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	Florida	2005	2006	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	California	2005	2006	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	Northwest	2005	2006	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Business (formerly MCI) Level 3 Communications	Massachusetts North America	2002-25 2005	2006 2006	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Level 3 Communications	Arizona	2003-2006	2006	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Global Crossing	North America	2005	2006	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Indianapolis Power & Light	IPL	2005	2006	Depreciation Study
2005				
AT&T Communications	North America	2004	2005	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications	California	2004	2005	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Sprint Florida, Inc.	Florida	2004	2005	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Sprint PCS	North America	2004	2005	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications Verizon Communications	Florida California	2004 2004	2005 2005	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications Verizon Communications	Northwest	2004	2005	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Sprint Communications, LP	North America	2004	2005	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Level 3 Communications	North America	2004	2005	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Global Crossing	North America	2004	2005	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Global Crossing	New York Special	0000 0 0004	0005	
Indianapolis Power & Light	Franchise Property IPL	2003 & 2004 2004	2005 2005	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Depreciation Study
	-	_00.	_000	2 5 prosidion olday
2004				
Sprint Florida, Inc.	Florida	2003	2004	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications Verizon Communications	California Northwest	2003 2003	2004 2004	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
VOLESTI COMMUNICATIONS	110111111001	2000	2007	
				QUALIFICATIONS 8

Page 9

Appraisal & Capital Recovery Activities Client List

Company	Property	Study Year	Year <u>Performed</u>	Activity
Verizon Communications	New England	2003	2004	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Sprint Communications, LP	North America	2003	2004	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Level 3 Communications	North America	2003	2004	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Global Crossing	North America	2003	2004	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Sprint PCS	Cost Indexes	2003	2004	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications	North America	2003	2004	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications	California	2003	2004	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Intermountain Gas Company	Idaho	2003	2004	Depreciation Study
2003				
Sprint Florida, Inc.	Florida	2002	2003	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	California	2002	2003	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	Northwest	2002	2003	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Sprint Communications, LP	North America	2002	2003	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Level 3 Communications	North America	2002	2003	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Sprint PCS	Cost Indexes	2002	2003	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications	North America	2002	2003	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications	California	2002	2003	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Global Crossing	North America	2002	2003	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Wireless	Broward County, FL	1998 through 2002	2003	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
2002				
Sprint Florida, Inc.	Florida	2001	2002	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	California	2001	2002	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	Northwest	2001	2002	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Sprint Communications, LP	North America	2001	2002	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Level 3 Communications	North America	2001	2002	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Global Crossing	North America	2001	2002	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Wireless	Plymouth, MI	2001	2002	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Sprint PCS	Cost Indexes	2001	2002	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications	North America	2001	2002	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Intermountain Gas Company	Idaho	2001	2002	Depreciation Study
AT&T Communications	California	2001	2002	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
2001				
Verizon	Verizon - New York	2001	2001-2	Functional Obsolescence & Useful Life studies for valuation
Sprint Florida, Inc.	Sprint Florida, Inc.	2000	2001	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	California	2000	2001	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Sprint Communications, LP	North America	2000	2001	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Global Crossing	North America	2000	2001	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Sprint PCS	Cost Indexes	2000	2001	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Sprint Corporation	Centel - Nevada	2000	2001-2	Depreciation Study
Alaska Communications System, Inc.	ACS of Alaska	2000	2001	Depreciation Study
(ACS)	ACS of Anchorage			
	ACS of Fairbanks			
	ACS of the Northland			
	ACS Holdings			

CV of Weinert

Page 10

Appraisal & Capital Recovery Activities Client List

Company	Property	Study <u>Year</u>	Year <u>Performed</u>	Activity
Sprint PCS Telus Communications	BTS Equipment Telus - Alberta & British Columbia	2000 2000	2000 2000	Economic Life Study Depreciation study Phase III Price Caps
Sprint Florida, Inc. Verizon Communications Sprint Communications, LP	Florida California North America	1999 1999 1999	2000 2000 2000	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
1999 Sprint Corporation	Centel - Nevada	1998	1999	Depreciation Study
Intermountain Gas Company Sprint Florida, Inc. Sprint Communications, LP	Intermountain Gas Company Florida North America	1998 1998 1998	1999 1999 1999	Depreciation Study Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
1998 Frontier Corporation	Frontier Telephone of Rochester	1998	1997	Valuation depreciation Lives and Net Salvage Parameters
Pacific Telecom, Inc.	Telephone Utilities of Washington	1997	1998	Depreciation Study
Sprint Florida, Inc. Verizon Communications Sprint Communications, LP	Florida Florida North America	1997 1997 1997	1998 1998 1998	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Sprint Corporation	United Telephone Company of South Carolina	1998	1998	Depreciation Expense Universal Service Fund
Sprint Corporation	Carolina Telephone and Telegraph and Central Telephone of North Carolina	1998	1998	Depreciation Expense Universal Service Fund
Telus Communications	Telus - Edmonton (TCE)	1997	1998	Depreciation Study Phase II Price Caps
1997 Sprint Corporation	Centel - Nevada	1997	1997	Unbundling/ Inter-connection Depreciation Study
Pacific Telecom, Inc.	Telephone Utilities of Oregon	1996	1997	Depreciation Study
Pacific Telecom, Inc.	Telephone Utilities of Alaska1996 And the Northland		1997	Depreciation Study
Telus Communications	Telus - TCI formerly AGT	1996	1997	Depreciation Study Phase II Price Caps
Indianapolis Power & Light	IPL	1996	1997	Depreciation Study
Sprint Florida, Inc. Verizon Communications	Florida Florida	1996 1996	1997 1997	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal

QUALIFICATIONS 10

CV of Weinert

Page 11

Appraisal & Capital Recovery Activities Client List

Company	Property	Study Year		ear <u>formed</u>	Activity
Pacific Telecom, Inc.	Eagle Telephone (Colorado) 19	96		1997	Depreciation Study
1996 Intermountain Gas Company Sprint Florida, Inc.	Intermountain Gas Company Florida	1995 1995		1996 1996	Depreciation Study Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Century Telephone	Century Telephone of Ohio, Inc	. 1995		1996	Depreciation Study
Telus Communications	AGT Limited (Alberta Government Telephone	1995 es)		1996	Depreciation Study
Johnson County Kansas Office of the Assessor	Useful Life of Computer Equipment	1995		1995	Useful/Market Life Analysis
Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District	Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District 19	95	1996	Depreci	ation Study
Sprint Corporation	Long Distance Division 19	95	1995	Depreci	ation/Recovery Status Study
Sprint Corporation	Cellular Division 19	95	1995	Depreci	ation/Recovery Status Study
Pacific Telecom, Inc.	Alascom, Inc. 19	94	1995	Depreci	ation Study
Pacific Telecom, Inc.	Telephone Utilities of the Northland 19	93	1994	Deprec	iation Study
	Telephone Utilities of Alaska 19	93	1994	Depre	ciation Study
Indiana Energy	Indiana Gas Company 19	93	1994	Depre	ciation Study
Columbia Gas Transmission	Gas Pipeline Property in Sullivan County, NY 19	93	1993	Usefu	I Life Study
United Telephone - Midwest Group	United Telephone Company of Missouri 19	93	1993	Depre	Modernization/ ciation Study
Intermountain Gas Co.	Intermountain Gas Co. 19	92	1993	Depre	ciation Study
Pacific Telecom, Inc.	Alascom, Inc. 19	92	1993	Depre	ciation Study
	Telephone Utilities of Oregon, Inc. 19	91	1992	Depre	eciation Study
	Telephone Utilities of Washington, Inc. 19	91	1992	Depre	eciation Study
Small Telephone Company Coalition	Oregon Small Telephone Companies 19	91	1992	Depre	ciation Support
United Telephone Systems	United Telephone Co. of 19 Pennsylvania	91	1992	Instruct	tional Depreciation Study QUALIFICATIONS 11

Page 12

Company		Property	Study <u>Year</u>	Year <u>Performed</u>	Activity
New York State Division of Equalization and Assessment		Electric, Gas, Water, Telephone, Pipeline, Steam, CATV	1991	1992	Useful Lives and Net Salvage Values
Rochester Telephone Company		Enterprise Telephone	1991	1992	Study Review
Indiana Energy		Indiana Gas/Richmond Gas Terre Haute Gas	s/ 1990	1991	Depreciation Study
American Electric Power		Indiana/Michigan Power Co	1990	1991	Depreciation Study
Rochester Telephone Company		Rochester Telephone Co.	1990	1991	Study Review
United Telephone Systems	United 1	Felephone Co. of Florida	1990	1991	Instructional Depreciation Study
United Telephone Systems		United Telephone Co. of Oregon	1989	1990	Study Review
Telephone and Data Systems, Inc.	Quincy	Telephone Company	1990	1991	Depreciation Study
Telephone and Data Systems, Inc.	Wolveri	ne Telephone Company	1989	1990	Depreciation Study
Indiana Energy		Indiana Gas Company, Inc.	1989	1990	Depreciation Study
Intermountain Gas Co.		Intermountain Gas Co.	1989	1990	Remaining Life/Net Salvage Support
North-West Telephone Company		North-West Telephone Company	1989	1990	Study Review
United Telephone System		United of Texas	1989	1990	Instructional Depreciation Study
		United of Missouri	1989	1990	Instructional Depreciation Study
Milwaukee Water		Milwaukee Water	1989	1990	Depreciation Study
Indiana Natural Gas Corp.		Indiana Natural Gas Corp.	1989	1990	Depreciation Study
Pacific Telecom		Telephone Utilities of the Northland	1989	1990	Depreciation Study
		Telephone Utilities of Alaska	1989	1990	Depreciation Study

QUALIFICATIONS 12

Page 13

Company	Property	<u>Year</u>	Study Ye <u>Performed</u>	ar <u>Activity</u>
	Alascom	1989	1990	Depreciation Study
	Telephone Utilities of Washington, Inc.	1988	1989	Depreciation Study
WICOR	Wisconsin Gas Company	1988	1989	Depreciation Study
ALLTEL	ALLTEL - Kentucky, Inc.	1987	1989	Depreciation Study
	ALLTEL - Ohio, Inc.	1988	1989	Depreciation Study
	Western Reserve Telephone Company	1988	1989	Depreciation Study
Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewer District	Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewer District	1988	1989	Depreciation Study
United Telephone	United of Ohio	1988	1989	ELG Support
Telephone Company	Telephone Company	1988	1989	ELG Support
United Telecom	U.S. Sprint	1988	1988	Useful Life Study
Pacific Telecom	Telephone Utilities of Oregon	1987	1988	Depreciation Study
	Telephone Utilities of Eastern Oregon	1987	1988	Depreciation Study
	Rose Valley Telephone Company	1987	1988	Depreciation Study
United Telephone	United of Minnesota	1987	1988	Capital Planning Support
Wisconsin Southern Gas	Wisconsin Southern Gas	1987	1988	Depreciation Study
Pacific Telecom	Glacier State Telephone Company	1986	1987	Depreciation Study
	Sitka Telephone Co.	1986	1987	Depreciation Study
	Juneau-Douglas Tel Company	1986	1987	Depreciation Study
Pacific Telecom	Telephone Utilities of Alaska	1986	1987	Depreciation Study
	Alascom	1986	1987	Depreciation Study
Lincoln	Lincoln Telephone and	1986	1987	Digital Switching QUALIFICATIONS 13

Page 14

			Study Year
Company	<u>Property</u>	<u>Year</u>	Performed Activity
Telecommunications	Telegraph Company		Service Life
Northwest Natural Gas Corporation	Northwest Natural Gas Corporation	1985	1986 Depreciation Study
ALLTEL	Western Reserve Telephone Company	1984	1985 Depreciation Study
	ALLTEL - Ohio	1984	1985 Depreciation Study
	ALLTEL - Alabama	1984	1985 Depreciation Study
Gulf Telephone Co.	Gulf Telephone Company	1984	1985 Depreciation Study
United Telephone Systems, Inc.	United of Iowa	1984	1985 Depreciation Study
Systems, mc.	United of Arkansas	1984	1985 Depreciation Study
Pacific Telecom	Telephone Utilities of Washington	1983	1984 Depreciation Study
	Telephone Utilities of Eastern Oregon	1983	1984 Depreciation Study
Pacific Telecom	Telephone Utilities of Oregon	1983	1984 Depreciation Study
	Northwestern Telephone Systems, Inc., Oregon	1983	1984 Depreciation Study
	Rose Valley Telephone Company	1983	1984 Depreciation Study
United Telecommunications	All United Telephone Companies	1983	1984 Capital Recovery Strategy
Lincoln Telecommunications	Lincoln Telephone & Telegraph Company	1983	1984 Depreciation Study
ALLTEL	ALLTEL - Mississippi	1982	1983 Depreciation Study
	ALLTEL - Michigan	1982	1983 Depreciation Study
North Carolina Natural Gas Corp.	North Carolina Natural Gas Corporation	1982	1983 Depreciation Study
Mid Continent Telephone (Currently ALLTEL)	Western Reserve Telephone	1982	1983 Depreciation Study
(Guileliny ALLTEL)	Mid Ohio Telephone	1982	1982 Depreciation Study
	Florence Telephone Company	1980	1981 Depreciation Study
	Company		OUAL IEU

QUALIFICATIONS 14

Page 15
Appraisal & Capital Recovery Activities Client List

Company	Property	Study <u>Year</u>	Year <u>Performed</u>	Activity
	Leeds Telephone Co.	1980	1981	Depreciation Study
	Elmore Coosa Tel Company	1980	1981	Depreciation Study
	Brookville Telephone Company	1980	1981	Depreciation Study
	Mid-Pennsylvania Telegraph	1980	1981	Depreciation Study
Telephone Utilities (Currently Pacific	Telephone Utilities of Oregon	1979	1980	Depreciation Study
Telecom)	Telephone Utilities of Eastern Oregon	1979	1980	Depreciation Study
	Northwestern Telephone Systems, IncOregon	1979	1980	Depreciation Study
	Rose Valley Telephone Company	1979	1980	Depreciation Study
United Telephone Systems, Inc.	United of Ohio	1979	1980	Depreciation Study
Telephone Utilities	Telephone Utilities of Washington	1978	1979	Depreciation Study
United Telephone Systems, Inc.	United of Ohio	1978	1979	Depreciation Study
Rochester Telephone	Rochester Telephone (Indiana)	1977	1978	Depreciation Study
United Telephone Systems, Inc.	United of Ohio	1977	1978	Depreciation Study
Princeton Telephone	Princeton Telephone	1976	1977	Depreciation Study
Northwestern Telephone	(Indiana) Northwestern Telephone (Illinois)	1975	1976	Depreciation Study

2011 <u>Training Instructor Depreciation Basics Sessions A & B and Life and Salvage Analysis</u>

Society of Depreciation Professionals 25th Annual Meeting

Atlanta, GA September 20-22, 2011

2010 Will the Real Cost Approach Please Stand Up?

National Association of Property Tax Representatives Transportation, Energy, & Communications (NAPTR-TEC)

Scottsdale, Arizona October 25-27, 2010

Issues Affecting Assessment of Regulated Industries

Institute for Professionals in Taxation (IPT) Property Tax Symposium

Austin, Texas October 31 - November 3, 2010

2009 (Valuing) Intangibles

Appraisal for Ad Valorem Taxation, Wichita State University

Wichita, Kansas July 28, 2009

Fair Value Accounting (Appraisal Panelist)

Appraisal for Ad Valorem Taxation, Wichita State University

Wichita, Kansas July 29, 2009

2008 Valuation Issues Valuation of Assets and the Impact of Depreciation

Society of Depreciation Professionals Annual Meeting

Greenville, SC September 21-26, 2008

Obsolescence in the Long-Distance and Local Transport Networks

Technology Futures Inc. Asset Valuation Conference

Austin Texas February 8, 2008

2007 Communications Industry Issues

National Association of Property Tax Representative – Transportation, Energy, & Communications

New Orleans, LA October 30, 2007

2006 Appraisal Procedures & Issues in a Changing communications Industry

Florida Chapter International Association of Assessing Officers' Tangible Personal Property Conference

Ocala, Florida January 12, 2006

Valuation of Intangibles

Appraisal for Ad Valorem Taxation, Wichita State University

Wichita, Kansas July 25, 2006

SDP 20 years of History and Beyond

Society of Depreciation Professionals 20th Annual Meeting

Long Beach, CA September 18, 2006

2005 Valuation in a World with Asset Impairments

Appraisal for Ad Valorem Taxation, Wichita State University

Wichita, Kansas August 1, 2005

2004 Depreciation in the Valuation of Assets

Society of Depreciation Professionals' Eighteenth Annual Meeting

Washington, D.C., September 13, 2004

2003 <u>Cost Approach and the Use of Appraisal Guidelines</u>

Institute for Professionals in Taxation – Property Tax Symposium

Fort Lauderdale, FL, September 17, 2003

Cost Approach – Obsolescence and Depreciation

Appraisal for Ad Valorem Taxation, Wichita State University

Wichita, Kansas, July 28, 2003

2000 Appraisal Issues Associated with Technological Change in the Wireline Telecommunications Industry

Appraisal for Ad Valorem Taxation, Wichita State University

Wichita, Kansas, July 31, 2000

The Impact of Advancing Technology and the Changing Regulatory Environment on Obsolescence

Calculations for Ad Valorem Valuation Purposes

Journal of Property Tax Management, Spring 2000

1996 How to Develop a Reproduction/Replacement Cost New Less Depreciation Approach to Value

Appraisal for Ad Valorem Taxation, Wichita State University

Wichita, Kansas, August 4, 1996

1995 <u>Valuation Method, Techniques and Strategies (How to Quantify Stranded Investment) (Market, Income,</u>

& Cost Approach

AGA Depreciation Committee Meeting

Denver, Colorado, August 6-9, 1995, jointly presented with Earl Robinson of AUS Consultants

1994 Integrating Future Expectations for the Telephone Industry into Historical Depreciation Analysis

United States Telephone Association (USTA's 1994 Capital Recovery Seminar)

Scottsdale, Arizona, September 12-13, 1994

1994 Capital Recovery: United States versus Canada

Canadian Telephone Industry's Annual Capital Recovery Seminar

Edmonton, Alberta, Canada June 14-15, 1994

1990 Capital Recovery: Methods, Terminology, Procedures, and Record Keeping

United States Telephone Association (USTA)'s

1990 Non-FCC Subject and Small Company Capital Recovery Seminar

Minneapolis, Minnesota April 10_11, 1990

Integration of Technology Forecasting Into Historical Life Studies

29th Iowa State Regulatory Conference

Ames, Iowa May 15-17, 1990

The 1990's and the Second Wave of Major Plant Retirements in the Communications Industry

NARUC's Seventh Biennial Information Conference

Columbus, Ohio September 12-14, 1990

How Do We Incorporate Change into the Study Filing Procedures?

USTA's 1990 Capital Recovery Seminar Chicago, Illinois October 16_17, 1990

1989 <u>Plant Modernization: Capital Planning and Capital Recovery</u>

Midwest Utilities Conference

Chicago, Illinois September 11 14, 1989

Price Indexes Today: Procedures, Uses, and Misuses

Society of Depreciation Professionals' Third Annual Meeting

New Orleans, Louisiana December 6_7, 1989

1988 Plant Modernization: Capital Planning and Capital Recovery

National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC)'s

Sixth Biennial Regulatory Information Conference

Columbus, Ohio September 14_16, 1988

1997	Sprint Corporation - West Finance Center Overland Park, Kansas, August 1997
1997	Rochester Telephone Corporation Rochester, New York, April 1997
1996	Sprint-Florida-Vista United Telecommunications Altamonte Springs, Florida August 27-29, 1996
1994	Saskatchewan Telecommunications Regina, Saskatchewan, Canada, June 1994
1994	AUS Consultants/Leroy J. Murphy and Associates 1994 Capital Recovery Seminar May 1994
1993	Manitoba Telephone System, Winnipeg, Manitoba, December 1993
1993	Society of Depreciation Professionals Annual Meeting Charleston, South Carolina September 30, 1993
1993	SPRINT - Local Telephone Division Atlanta, Georgia August 11-12, 1993
1993	AUS Consultants/Leroy J. Murphy and Associates 1993 Capital Recovery Seminar Chicago, Illinois May 11 - 13, 1993
1993	Canadian Telephone Capital Recovery Seminar Halifax, Nova Scotia April 20 - 22, 1993
1993	United Telephone, Midwest Group Overland Park, Kansas January 20, 1993
1992	BellSouth Corporation Birmingham, Alabama November 23, 1992
1992	Sprint - Local Telephone Division Kansas City, Kansas November 18 - 20, 1992
1992	Society of Depreciation Professionals Annual Meeting San Antonio, Texas September 9 - 10, 1992
1992	AUS Consultants/Leroy J. Murphy and Associates 1992 Capital Recovery Seminar Chicago, Illinois October 6 - 8, 1992
1991	Society of Depreciation Professionals Annual Meeting Nashville, Tennessee November 20-22, 1991
1991	ALLTEL Corporation Microcomputer Depreciation Studies System Training Hudson, Ohio October 14-16, 1991

CV Weinert Page 20

Capital Recovery Training

2016	Society of Depreciation Professionals Annual Training Charleston, South Carolina, September 18-23, 2016
2015	Society of Depreciation Professionals Annual Training Austin Texas September 2015
2014	Society of Depreciation Professionals Annual Training New Orleans, Louisiana September 2014
2013	Society of Depreciation Professionals Annual Training Salt Lake City, Utah September 2013
2012	Society of Depreciation Professionals Annual Training Minneapolis, Minnesota, September 16-18, 2012
1991	United Telecommunications, Inc., Capital Recovery/Microcomputer Depreciation Studies System Training Kansas City, Kansas September 23-25, 1991
1991	AUS Consultants/Leroy J. Murphy and Associates 1991 Capital Recovery Seminar Lake Geneva, Wisconsin September 17-19, 1991
1991	Rochester Telephone Corporation, Capital Recovery/Microcomputer Depreciation Studies System Training, Rochester, New York September 3-7, 1991
1991	Ameritech Services, Microcomputer Depreciation Studies System Training Chicago, Illinois May 16-17, 1991
1991	AUS Consultants/Leroy J. Murphy and Associates 1991 Capital Recovery Seminar Washington, D.C. April 9_11, 1991
1990	United Telecommunications, Inc., Capital Recovery Seminar Overland Park, Kansas December 1990
1990	AUS Consultants/Leroy J. Murphy and Associates 1990 Capital Recovery Seminar Chicago, Illinois September 24_27, 1990
1990	AUS Consultants/Leroy J. Murphy and Associates 1990 Capital Recovery Seminar Chicago, Illinois January 29-February 1, 1990
1990	United Telecommunications, Inc., Capital Recovery/Microcomputer Depreciation Studies System Training, Chicago, Illinois July 1990
1989	United Telecommunications, Inc., Capital Recovery/Microcomputer Depreciation Studies System Training, Chicago, Illinois July 1989

Capital Recovery Training

1989	AUS Consultants/Leroy J. Murphy and Associates 1989 Capital Recovery Seminar Chicago, Illinois March 6_9, 1989
1988	AUS Consultants/Leroy J. Murphy and Associates 1988 Capital Recovery Seminar Chicago, Illinois July 25_28, 1988
1988	United Telecommunications, Inc., Microcomputer Depreciation Studies System Training Kansas City, Kansas January 1988